

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-19 are presented for consideration. Claims 11-19 are new. Unless indicated to the contrary, claims are amended for non-statutory reasons, such as to delete European-style phraseology. No new matter is added.

Because Applicants have not exceeded the claim limits accorded the basic filing fee, no new fees are believed to be due for the newly added claims.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of acceptance of the drawings and receipt of all certified copies of priority documents.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Jepsen, et al.* (US Patent Publication 2005/075386). For at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-19 are patentable over the applied art.

At the outset Applicants rely at least on the following standards with regard to proper rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Notably, a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. *See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. *See, e.g., In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 31 USPQ2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Alternatively, anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be embodied in a single prior art device or practice. *See, e.g., Minnesota Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 1559, 24 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1992). For anticipation, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *See, e.g., Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

i. Claims 1 and 10

Claim 1 is drawn to a decentralized power generation system, and features:

“...a plurality of decentralized power generating units, wherein none of the plurality of power generating units is a fuel cell...”

Claim 10 is drawn to a method of operating a decentralized power generation system and includes a similar feature.

By contrast to the noted features of claims 1 and 10, *Jepsen, et al.* discloses at least one of the power generation devices is a fuel cell. Therefore, the applied art fails to disclose at least one feature of each of claims 1 and 10. Thus, claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the applied art. Moreover, claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over the applied art for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jepsen, et al.* alone or in combination with secondary and tertiary references. These claims depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly, and thus are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants in no way concede the propriety of the rejection, and reserve the opportunity to address these in further correspondence as necessary.

New Claims

Claim 11 is also drawn to a decentralized power generation system. Claim 11 features:

“...a plurality of DC/DC converters, each of the DC/DC converters being connected to another one of the power generating units for converting a current provided by the power generating units;...

and at least one power receiving component connected to the DC bus for retrieving current from the DC bus, wherein a respective predetermined output voltage is set for each of the DC-DC converters, and the current provided by each of the DC-DC converters is prevented from exceeding a respective predetermined maximum value.”

Support for the noted features may be found at page 9, line 27 through page 10, line 6. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim 11 is patentable over the applied art. Moreover, claims 11-19, which depend from claim 11, are also patentable over the applied art for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any additional fees, including, but not limited to, the fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:
Phillips Electronics North America Corp.

/William S. Francos, Esq/
by: William S. Francos (Reg. No. 38,456)
Date: December 6, 2007

Volentine Francos & Whitt, PLLC
Two Meridian Blvd.
Wyomissing, PA 19610
(610) 375-3513 (v)
(610) 375-3277 (f)